



Using Human Capital Data Reports

September 14, 2015

Today's Panelists

- Blount County Schools
 - Rob Britt, Director of Schools
 - David Murrell, Assistant Director of Schools for Administration and Personnel
- Lenoir City Schools
 - Jeanne Barker, Director of Schools
 - Pam Sims, Supervisor of Instruction
- Wilson County Schools
 - Donna Wright, Director of Schools
 - Mary Ann Sparks, Deputy Director of Schools

The key lever to drive district improvement is the quality of its people

Preparation

Recruitment

Hiring

Evaluation
and
Development

Compensation

Teacher
Leadership
and Pathways

Effective evaluation implementation allows districts to make **“smarter”** decisions about teacher recruitment, selection, evaluation, development, compensation, and retention.

In 2014-15, human capital data reports were created for each district

- Effective evaluation implementation is integral to making more **intentional** human capital decisions
- Using three years of evaluation data, these tables provide a **snapshot** of information that help assess human capital performance
 - Distribution and alignment
 - Growth and development
 - Retention of persistently high and low performers
 - Hiring
- Finding out **WHY or HOW** is the next level of analysis that district leaders can explore

Section I: Distribution and Alignment

Table 1: Distribution of Scores

	Number of Teachers with Data	Percent 1s	Percent 2s	Percent 3s	Percent 4s	Percent 5s
Overall Level of Effectiveness	100 of 110	15.0%	25.0%	15.0%	15.0%	30.0%
Observation Average	100 of 110	15.0%	25.0%	15.0%	15.0%	30.0%
Growth Score: All Teachers	100 of 110	15.0 %	25.0%	15.0%	15.0%	30.0%
Growth Score: Teachers with Individual Growth Scores	50	20.0%	20.0%	15.0%	10.0%	35.0%
Achievement Measure	100 of 110	15.0%	25.0%	15.0%	15.0%	30.0%

Section I: Distribution and Alignment (cont.)

Table 2: Alignment between individual growth scores and observation scores

Number of Teachers with Observation Scores and Individual Growth Scores	District Average Percent Aligned or within Two Levels	District Average Percent Misaligned by Three or More Levels	State Average Misaligned by Three or More Levels
40 out of 50	90.0%	10.0%	12.5%

Section 2: Growth and Development

	2013-14 Individual Growth Scores					
2012-13 Individual Growth Scores		1	2	3	4	5
	1 (20 teachers)	5.0% (1)	25.0% (5)	10.0% (2)	10.0% (2)	50.0% (10)
	2 (10 teachers)	20.0% (2)	10.0% (1)	20.0% (2)	40.0% (4)	10.0% (1)
	3 (50 teachers)	20.0% (10)	0.0% (0)	20.0% (10)	20.0% (10)	40.0% (20)
	4 (10 teachers)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	40.0% (4)	60.0% (6)
	5 (5 teachers)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	40.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	60.0% (3)

Section 3: Retention

Table 4: Persistently High versus Persistently Low Performing Teachers

	Persistently Low Performing	Persistently High Performing
District	25.0% (5 out of 20)	75% (15 out of 20)
State	8.9% (1,331 out of 14,924)	45.3% (6,757 of out 14,924)

Section 3: Retention (cont'd)

Table 5: Teachers who left the District

Overall Level of Effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
10 Teacher(s)	0	2	4	3	1

Section 4: Hiring

Table 7: New Hires in 2014-15 based on 2013-14 Overall Level of Effectiveness

	District: Total Teachers	District: Percent of Teachers	State: Percent of Teachers
Newly Hired in Tennessee	40	80.0%	45.3%
Level 1	0	0.0%	5.0%
Level 2	2	4.0%	5.4%
Level 3	1	2.0%	12.3%
Level 4	1	2.0%	15.4%
Level 5	6	12.0%	16.6%
Total New Hires	50	100.0%	100.0%

Discussion for the panelists

Closing thoughts

- If you would like a copy of your district's human capital data report, please contact:
 - Your CORE Director or
 - Sylvia Flowers, Executive Director of Educator Talent